

Hello supervisors,

Firstly, I support the recommendations and reasoning of information provided by MCA and Attorney Hannah Nelson pertaining to the cannabis agenda items today.

However, in reviewing the Ad Hoc/Staff recommendations before the Board, I am struck by the lack of clarity in many cases and general abandonment of Phase 1 and 2 permittee concerns through out.

I want to bring to your and the public's attention that former Supervisors and the former Planning and Building Services Director bullied the Board into rushing through to the ordinance recommendations you are considering. I believe you think you are creating a land use permit pathway for all cultivators, permitted or not, but we've already established that neither local staff or CDFA staff will be able to process our current thousand plus Phase 1 applicants and permittees let alone open application review to Phase 3 applicants. Approving these ordinance recommendations without significant additional editions will only confound our mutual goals of Annual Licenses. Ask Sup. Williams to refresh your understanding of available staff requirements as he has "done the math".

Please register my complaint that 10% of a given parcel is much to large to approve for cannabis cultivation. Such large scale cannot be managed in a careful way that insures a high quality product with mitigatable impacts of petro chemical fertilizers, pesticides, herbicides, fungicides, odor, pollen drift, noise etc., etc.,. **As you know cultivation size expansion greater than one acre is not allowed at the state level until January of 2023, hense anyone advocating for a 10% of parcel size cultivation permit will not be legal with the state for at least two more years.** Therefore, a slower and more considered process regarding such huge potential cultivations and their potential negative impacts can proceed more slowly. At this time the Board need only consider the allowance of expansion to an acre.

Also, please consider an Ad Hoc meeting with the Planning Commission prior to their review of any cannabis ordinance sent for their review. I am doubtful they are well enough informed to analyze many cannabis issue correctly. For example, when I advocated before the Planning Commission a couple years ago when the community was trying to get the Board to allow for transfer of permits beyond immediate family, one of the commissioners asked her colleagues, "now that we have regulations, won't the black market go away". I fear they may still be out of touch without a directed education meeting.

Please review and reconsider why the County has continued to tie Microbusiness licenses to Cottage or Home Occupation licenses? State Microbusiness licenses are allowed where ever cultivation is allowed and Mendocino's use ordinance should be consistent in this regard. Many stake holders and a County Working Group formed by the Board over two years ago advocated for Microbusiness licenses to be available under Phase 1 to cultivation permittees. Please ask Staff to read the state regulations to you so you better understand how the Microbusiness license will allow Craft Cultivators to perform additional activities on a limited scale but in more favorable competition with large operations through out the state. Paul Hansbury confirmed with the State many months ago that all Microbusiness activities must be contained within 10,000 sf. Small farms are appropriate for Microbusiness licenses.

Thank you for your consideration and further analysis of the issues discussed above.

Sincerely,

Corinne Powell